DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 582 CS 200 673

AUTHOR	Gordon, Thomas F.; Surlin, Stuart H.
TITLE	Racial Differences in Attitudes toward Direct Reference Political Advertising.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	73p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism (Ft. Collins, Colorado, August 1973)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes; Beliefs; Elections; *Mass Media; Northern Attitudes; *Political Influences; Politics; *Publicize; Public Relations; *Racial Attitudes; Racial Differences; Social Differences; Southern Attitudes; Telecommunication; Values; Voting
IDENTIFIERS	*Political Advertising; Regional Differences

ABSTRACT

Random telephone surveys in a northern and a southern city were initiated to determine attitudes toward "informative" and "direct reference" mass media political advertisements. Responses were organized in regional, social, and racial categories. The results quantified reactions to the two types of political messages of blacks and whites from various socioeconomic levels in the North and the South. Statistical analysis of the responses indicated that the strictly informative advertisements were favored by a majority of the respondents over messages which attacked political opponents. However, whites were more tolerant of direct reference (attacking) advertisements than blacks, and southerners objected less to aggressive messages than did northerners. It was concluded, however, that attitudes toward types of political advertisements cannot be best appraised on regional, social, or racial grounds without consideration of the complete value systems held by individual respondents. (CH)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083582

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE POLITICAL ADVERTISING

By

Thomas F. Gordon
Radio-Television-Film Department
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa.

and

Stuart H. Surlin
School of Journalism
University of Georgia
Athens, Ga.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas F. Gordon
Stuart H. Surlin
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Minorities and Communications Division
Association for Education in Journalism

1973 Convention, August 19-22
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Research Assistants: Ronald Halbert
Mary Ellen Verna

CS 200 673

RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE POLITICAL ADVERTISING

BY

Thomas F. Gordon and Stuart H. Surlin

The increasing usage of mass media in the political arena is self evident. Media time used for political advertising and the amount of money spent on such advertising has shown an ever increasing rate* (Gilbert, 1972, Mickelson, 1972). The principle is simple: the mass media are able to effectively reach the most people with the least effort and expense.

As political media usage has increased, the phenomena of the direct reference or attacking political advertisement has also increased (Archibald, 1971a; 1971b). Historically, complaints about dirty politics and unfair ads appear to follow particular patterns during every election year. Sheinkopf (1972) reported that more complaints are aimed at print rather than broadcast advertising and that the most complaints came from people in the East and the least by people in the South. Sheinkopf was too optomistic, however, when he stated before the 1972 elections, "Still, there is some hope for improvement in the ethics of the campaigning this year." (p.9) An abundance of political advertising attacking the opposing candidates existed during the 1972 presidential election. Archibald (1972) chairman of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee has indicated that complaints to his committee during the past presidential election have increased over previous elections; and, that the candidates used more ads attacking the other candidate than positive ads about themselves.

---

* This trend did appear to level off between the 1968 and 1972 elections due to recent laws restricting political advertising (Broadcasting, 1973).

The present report focuses on racial differences in attitudes toward political advertising in general, and direct reference (attacking) ads specifically. For comparison, regional differences and social class differences are also examined. Hyman (1959) notes that perceptions of the political process are involved in a mixture of cognition and evaluation, of belief and attitude, of percept and affect which is probably best described as the individual's cognitive and affective map of politics. Building on this orientation, the authors attempted to assess characteristics of the respondents that might relate to or affect their attitudes toward political advertising. As Nimmo (1970) suggests, "Voters' perceptions of the short-term forces...parties,.candidates, issues...normally conform to their long-term predisposition." (p. 177) The predispositions selected for investigation in this case were aspects of the respondent's value system.

METHODOLOGY

Procedures

Systematic random samples were drawn from the 1972 metropolitan phone directories for Atlanta, Georgia (N=670) and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (N=700). Trained interviewers made calls between the dates of October 25 and November 1, 1972.

Items designed to assess perceptions of political advertising were constructed as agree-disagree statements. Interviewers were instructed to read the item, asking whether the respondent agreed with the item, was neutral, or disagreed. If the respondent agreed or disagreed, he was then asked to specify "agree (disagree) or strongly agree (disagree)." Thus, the full five point scale was utilized. The results of the calls for each city are as follows:

	Atlanta	Philadelphia
completed	281	279
not in service	48	67
no answer	214	219
refusal	127	135

In Atlanta, of the 408 contacts made, the completion rate was 69%. In Philadelphia, of the 414 contacts made, the completion rate was 67%. The percentage of males and females in the Atlanta sample was 45% male, 55% female; in Philadelphia, 34% male, 66% female. Racially, 85% of the Atlanta sample was white and 14% black, while 73% of the Philadelphia sample was white and 26% black.*

Although the initial intent of the survey was to examine racial differences in attitudes toward political advertising, other assessments of the respondent's value system were made in order to examine the extent

*Racially, the 1970 census indicated that the Atlanta Metropolitan area was 22% Black while the Philadelphia Metropolitan area was 33% Black.

to which these variables related to political attitudes. The first set of questions were intended to tap the four major dimensions of: (1) need for stability in one's environment, (2) concern for the social welfare of others, (3) propensity for cooperation toward group goals, and (4) tendency to identify with a group. Three items were selected from the Rehfisch Rigidity scale (Rehfisch, 1958) to tap the individual's need for stability. Other items relating to social values were selected from the Perloe Social Values Questionnaire (Perloe, 1967). The Perloe items were derived from a factor analytic study which isolated the value dimensions of social welfare, cooperation toward group goals, identification with groups, and moral pressure. Three-four items were taken from each of these categories except the latter. This dimension was excluded to keep the questionnaire to a reasonable length for the telephone interviewing.

To justify the usage of partial instruments from two different sources, and to verify the a priori dimension structure, the combined Atlanta-Philadelphia data were factor analyzed using a principal axis solution with verimax rotation and Kaiser normalization. Table 1 presents the resulting factor items and loadings. The four factors explained 46.2% of the total variance. The items loading on each factor were summed as indicies of these dimensions to be used in subsequent analyses.

Table 1 about here

Attitudes Toward Direct Reference Advertising

To assess attitudes toward direct reference or attacking political advertising, agree-disagree items were designed to tap (1) the information value of the ads, (2) the perceived ethics involved, and (3) the effectiveness and affectiveness of this form of advertising. A single item was included to assess the extent to which attacks were evident in news and speeches as well as paid advertising. The item read, "I see and hear attacks by the presidential candidates as often in the news and speeches as I do in advertising." A second single item assessed attitudes toward product advertising in which an opposing product is attacked. This item read, "In general, advertising for products, not for political use, but for products, which attacks a competitor in any fashion, makes me more favorable toward the sponsor of the ad." The same interview procedure was used to administer the five point agree-disagree scale.

Again, the items designed to assess attitudes toward political advertising were factor analyzed using the principal axis solution with verimax rotation and Kaiser normalization. Three major factors resulted, explaining 62.8% of the total variance. See Table 2 for the factor items and loadings. Items loading on each factor were summed as indicies for use in subsequent analyses.

Table 2 about here

RESULTS

Given the focus on racial differences in attitudes toward direct reference (attacking) ads, and the corresponding relationship of the respondent's value system to those attitudes, the first basic analyses were intended to determine the extent to which socioeconomic status (SES) differences and regional differences interacted with race. Should interaction effects be evident, the factors of SES and region would have to be examined directly with the race factor or controlled out.

RACE and SES

The comparison of race with SES to look for interaction effects was achieved through a two-way analysis of covariance (Race X SES) in which the respondent's value systems were covaried to hold their effects constant (covariates: (1) Need for Stability; (2) Concern for the Special Welfare of Others; (3) Cooperation Toward Group Goals; (4) Identification With a Group). This analysis, for the five major attitudes toward direct reference ads (extent to which such ads are considered: (1) Unethical (2) Informative; (3) Affective; (4) Extent to which similar attacking behaviors are seen in News and Speeches; and (5) favorability toward attacking Product Advertising) for the combined north-south data produced no significant interaction effects. Main effects were evident for race and SES, however. Since racial differences will be examined in detail as related to the respondent's value system, only SES differences will be presented here.

The main effects SES differences indicate that lower SES respondents see the direct reference ads as more Unethical ($p < .003$); more Informative ($p < .002$); see fewer attacks in News and Speeches ($p < .06$)

and are more favorable toward attacking Product Advertising ($p < .08$) than are middle SES respondents. See Appendix A for mean and standard deviation values of covariates and for analyses of covariance tables (Race X SES) for each dependent variable. Relative to interaction effects, the Race by SES findings for the combined north-south data held true when the same analyses were done for Northern and Southern regions independently--no significant interaction affects appeared.

Race and Region

To examine potential race by region interaction effects the same analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) procedure used with the SES variable was applied (covariates and dependent variables were as listed above). No interaction effects were noted although main effects for race and for region did appear. Again, since racial differences will be examined in detail relative to the respondent's value system, only regional differences will be presented here.

The main effects for region demonstrated that Northerners saw attacking ads as more Informative ($p < .02$) than did Southerners and were also more favorable toward attacking Product Advertising ($p < .07$). The reverse was true for the tendency to see attacks in News and Speeches. Here, Southerners were more likely than Northerners to see such attacks ($p < .05$). See Appendix B for mean and standard deviation values of covariates and for analyses of covariance tables (Race X Region) for each dependent variable.

RACE AND THE RESPONDENT'S VALUE SYSTEM

To examine the relationship between race, the respondent's value system, and attitudes toward direct reference ads, the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) approach was again used. Each of the four major

value dimensions were analysed independently with race in a two-way analysis of covariance, covarying the remaining three value dimensions. For example, if Race by Need for Stability was the two-way analysis, the remaining value dimensions of Concern for Social Welfare, Cooperation Toward Group Goals, and Identification With a Group were Covaried to control their effects. The covariates analyses of the dependent variables (attitudes toward the attacking ads) for the combined north-south data as well as north vs. south differences will be presented for each major Race by Value analysis.

RACE BY GROUP IDENTIFICATION

Table 3A presents the mean and standard deviation values of the covariates for this two-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) using combined north-south data. Tables 3B-3F present the covariance analyses (Race X Group I.D.) for each dependent variable.

Ethics. Table 3B presents the ANCOVA for attitudes tapping the extent too which direct reference ads are felt to be unethical. For this overall analysis the regression effect, indicating the degree of linear relationship between the dependent variable and the covariates, is nonsignificant. Similarly, no significant main effect appears for the race factor or the interaction effect. However, a significant main effect for Group Identification is evident. Here, respondents scoring high on Group I.D. say the attacking ads are more unethical than those scoring moderately on the Group I.D. factor ($p < .01$).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3B about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Separate covariate analyses for the Northerners only and the Southerners only were computed. For the Northerners the result was the same, the Group I.D. comparison being the only significant difference ($p < .01$) (see Appendix C). For the Southerners only, the Group I.D. split for Blacks produced a cell with only nine individuals; thus, although no differences were evident, the small cell size negates the calculation of stable statistics and, as such, is not included.

Information. Table 3C provides the Race by Group I.D. ANCOVA for the informative value of the direct reference ads (combined north-south data). Although the interaction effect is not significant, the race (p .001) and Group I.D. ($p < .01$) main effects are. The race factor shows that Blacks find the ads to be more informative than do Whites. For the Group I.D. factor, those scoring high find the ads to be more informative than those scoring lower.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3C about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Again, because of the small cell size for the Southerners, the only within region comparison made was for Northerners. Here, the race factor reflected the overall results ($p < .001$) (see Appendix C) while the Group I.D. difference disappeared.

Affect. Table 3D presents the ANCOVA for affective differences in reaction to the attacking ads. No interaction effect is evident. Significant main effects appear for both Race and Group I.D. For the

race factor, Blacks see the ads as more affective than do Whites ($p < .001$). Those respondents scoring high on Group Identification felt the ads were more affective than did those scoring lower on Group I.D. ($P < .005$).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3D about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The separate analysis for the Northern region only produced the same results on both factors, race ($p < .07$) and Group I.D. ($p < .005$).

News and Speeches. Table 3E presents the results of this attitudinal dimension tapping the extent to which attacks are seen in news and speeches as often as in political ads. None of the comparisons in this analysis produced a significant difference. The same held true for the analysis within the Northern region (see Appendix C).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3E about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Product Advertising. Table 3F presents the ANCOVA comparing favorability toward direct reference product advertising. Here, the regression effect indicated a significant linear relationship between the covariates and the dependent variable ($p < .001$). Also, although no interaction effect appears, the race factor is a significant main effect ($p < .004$).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3F about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The race difference indicates that Blacks are more favorable toward attacking product advertising than are Whites. This difference holds true for the within region comparison for Northerners also ($p < .04$) (See Appendix C).

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY

Table 4A presents the mean and standard deviation values of the covariates for this two-way analysis of covariance (combined north-south data). Tables 4B-4F present the covariance analyses (Race X Stability) for each dependent variable.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4A about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ethics. The significant regression effect ($p < .002$) in Table 4B indicates that the covariates do have a significant linear relationship with the dependent variable (extent to which attacking ads are felt to be unethical). As such, controlling their effects was worthwhile. The main effects of race and need for stability, and the interaction effect are not significant.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4B about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

These same results held true for separate covariate analyses of Northerners only and of Southerners only (see Appendix C). Thus, there are no major differences between Blacks and Whites and between respondents with high need for stability and those with moderate need for stability on the extent to which direct reference ads are felt to be unethical.

Information. Table 4C (Race X Stability) presents the ANCOVA analysis of the extent to which attacking ads are felt to be informative (combined north-south data). Again, the significant regression effect ($p < .02$) demonstrates the worth of controlling the covariates.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4C about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

No interaction effect is evident in Table 4C and the main effect comparison of high vs. moderate need for stability respondents is also nonsignificant. A strong racial difference is evident, however ($p < .001$). Here, Blacks find the attacking ads to be more informative than do Whites. This same finding holds true for the separate covariate analyses for Northerners only ($p < .001$) and for Southerners only ($p < .02$) (see Appendix C). Thus, relative to attitudes toward the information value of direct reference ads, those with high, as compared to low, need for stability do not differ. Blacks, however, find the ads to be more informative than do Whites.

Affect. Table 4D presents the Race X Stability covariance analysis for the combined north-south data relative to the affective value of direct reference ads. Here, the regression effect was marginally significant ($p < .10$).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4D about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Although the main effect comparison between those with high vs. moderate need for stability was not significant, the race comparison and the interaction effects were. Interpretation of the race main effect, which shows Blacks viewing the attacking ads as more affective than Whites ($p < .001$), must yield to the significant race by need for stability interaction ($p < .03$). The means in Table 4D indicate that the interaction occurs because Blacks view the attacking ads as more affective than do Whites and, as opposed to Whites, this is more true of Blacks with high need for stability than for Blacks with low need for stability.

The same racial main effect holds true for the North only ($p < .05$) and the South only ($p < .003$) analyses. However, the interaction effect is evident only in the North ($p < .003$) (see Appendix C).

The evidence indicates, then, that racial differences evident relative to the affective effects of attacking ads are significantly linked to the individual's need for stability that the two factors should not be dealt with independently, especially for samples involving the Northern region.

News and Speeches. Table 4E presents the Race X Stability ANCOVA for the extent to which attacks are seen in news and speeches as opposed to political ads. Again, this Table is for combined north-south data. In all comparisons, no differences appeared. This no difference finding held for the analyses by Northern and Southern region independently (see Appendix C).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4E about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Product Advertising. Table 4G presents the ANCOVA for attitudes toward attacking product advertising (combined north-south data).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 4G about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

For this analysis, no interaction effects are evident and the regression effect is nonsignificant. However, the race factor ($p < .001$) and the stability dimension ($p < .05$) produced significant differences. Blacks are more favorable toward attacking product ads than are Whites; respondents with high need for stability are more favorable than those with low need for stability.

For the race factor, the same results held for the analyses among the Northerners ($p < .01$) and among the Southerners ($p < .03$). On the stability factor the Northern analysis produced the same results as the

combined data ($p < .03$) while no difference was evident among the Southerners (see Appendix C). Thus, the racial difference is strong overall while differences between those with high vs. low need for stability is dominant only among Northerners.

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE

Table 5A presents the mean and standard deviation values of the covariates for this analysis (combine north-south data). Tables 5B-5F present the ANCOVA's for the dependent variables.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5A about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ethics. Table 5B presents the ANCOVA for attitudes tapping the extent to which direct reference ads are seen as unethical (combined data). Here, the regression effect is significant ($p < .001$). However, no main effects or interaction effect are evident. These same results hold for the Northern and Southern regions as separate analyses (see Appendix C).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5B about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Information. Table 5C presents this ANCOVA dealing with how informative direct reference ads are felt to be (combined data). The regression effect reached the .03 level of significance. No interaction effect was evident.

As would be expected from the previous analysis, the race factor remained strong as a main effect ($p < .001$) with Blacks saying the attacking ads are more informative than do Whites. There were no differences between those with high concern for the social welfare of others and those with low concern. These findings held for the analyses done for Northerners ($p < .001$, race) and Southerners ($p < .008$, race) independently (see Appendix C).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5C about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Affect. Table 5D presents the ANCOVA for the affective value of the attacking ads (combined data). A major interaction effect is evident between race and concern for Social Welfare ($p < .002$). This takes precedents over the strong main effect for race in which Blacks see the ads as more affective than do Whites ($p < .001$). Overall, the interaction indicates that Blacks see the ads as more affective than do Whites and, as opposed to Whites, this is more true for Blacks with high concern for the social welfare of others than for Blacks with low concern.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5D about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The separate analyses for Northerners ($p < .06$) and Southerners ($p < .002$) produced the same main effect racial differences. However, the interaction effect held for the Southern sample only ($p < .001$). (see Appendix C).

News and Speeches. Table 5E presents the race by social welfare ANCOVA for tendency to see attacks in News and Speeches as opposed to political advertising (combined data). The significant effect evident is the race by social welfare interaction. Here, Whites, moreso than Blacks, say they see attacks in news and speeches as often as in political ads and, as opposed to Blacks, this is more true for Whites low in concern for the social welfare of others than for those high in concern. No effects differences were evident for the Northern or Southern analyses.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5E about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Product Advertising. Table 5F presents the ANCOVA results for attitudes toward attacking product ads (combined data). The major result, here, is a significant interaction between race and concern for social welfare ($p < .05$). Interpretation of the main effect for the race factor ($p < .007$) must yield to the more complex interaction.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 5F about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The interaction indicates that Blacks are more favorable toward attacking product ads than are Whites and, contrary to Whites, this is more true for Blacks with high concern for the social welfare of others than for those with low concern.

The separate analyses produced similar differences on the race factor for Northerners ($p < .08$) and Southerners ($p < .04$). The interaction effect held for the Northerners only ($p < .05$) (see Appendix C).

RACE BY COOPERATION TOWARD GROUP GOALS

Table 6A presents the mean and standard deviation values of the covariates for this two-way ANCOVA (Combined north-south data). Tables 6B-6F present the covariance analyses for each dependent variable.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6A about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Ethics. Table 6B presents the ANCOVA for attitudes reflecting the extent to which attacking ads are seen as unethical. Although the regression effect is significant ($p < .002$), none of the major effects reached significance.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6B about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

With the individual comparisons within region, the Southern break again produced an insufficient cell size for stable statistical comparisons. Thus, only the Northern region will be examined in separate ANCOVAs. The results of the Northern comparison were the same as the combined data, no significant interaction or main effects appeared. (see Appendix C).

Information. Table 6C presents the ANCOVA comparison of respondent attitudes toward the informative value of attacking ads. The major difference in this analysis is an interaction effect between race and cooperation toward group goals ($p < .03$). The significant factor in the previous Social Welfare comparison is, as expected, evident here as well ($p < .001$).

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6C about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

From the pattern of the means, the interpretation of the interaction effect is that Blacks see the attacking ads as more informative than do Whites and this is more true for those scoring high on cooperation toward group goals that those scoring low.

The separate ANCOVA for Northerners only maintained the main effect difference for race ($p < .001$) and the interaction effect was marginally significant ($p < .106$). Thus, relative to consideration of racial differences in attitudes toward the informational value of attacking ads, the factor of cooperation toward group goals should be accounted for.

Affect. Table 6D presents the ANCOVA for the affective value of the attacking ads. The major difference is an interaction effect involving race and cooperation toward group goals ($p < .05$). This interaction stems from the race difference ($p < .001$) which was evident in previous race by value analyses for the affect dimension.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6D about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The interaction effect indicates that Blacks find the attacking ads to be more affective than do Whites and that this is more true for Blacks scoring high on cooperation toward group goals than for those scoring lower on this dimension. The separate analysis for the Northern group failed to produce the significant interaction effect. (see Appendix C).

News and Speeches. Table 6E presents the ANCOVA for this attitudinal dimension. None of the comparisons reached significance. This held true for the Northern analysis also.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6E about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Product Advertising. Table 6F presents the ANCOVA comparison of attitudes toward attacking product ads. Here, the regression effect indicates a significant relationship between the covariates and the dependent variable. A main effect for race is evident in which Blacks, moreso than Whites, are favorable toward attacking

product ads ($p < .004$). Again, this race difference follows with the other race by value analyses for this attitudinal comparison.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 6F about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The significant interaction effect in this analysis indicates that Blacks are more positive toward direct reference ads than are Whites and, as opposed to Whites, this is more true for Blacks high on the cooperation factor than those low on cooperation. The ANCOVA for the Northern region produced the same main effect racial difference ($p < .04$) and interaction effect ($p < .009$) (see Appendi : C).

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Given the exploratory nature of this study, the following summary of findings is intended to provide hypotheses for future testing.

SUMMARY

SES Differences: (No race by SES interaction effects were evident.)

1. Lower SES respondent feel that direct reference political ads are more UNETHICAL, and more INFORMATIVE than do middle SES respondents

   (Overall, on the absolute scales used, both lower and middle SES respondents were saying the ads were slightly unethical on the ethics scale, and slightly informative on the information scale.)

2. Middle SES respondents are more likely to see attacks in NEWS AND SPEECHES (as compared to political ads) than are lower SES respondents.

   (Overall, both lower and middle SES respondents were slightly positive toward the statement questioning whether they see as many attacks in news and speechas as in political ads.)

3. Lower SES respondents are more favorable toward direct reference PRODUCT ADVERTISING than are middle SES respondents.

   (Overall, both lower and middle SES respondents were slightly negative toward the statement contending that attacking product ads make them more positive toward the source of the ad.)

Regional Differences: (There were no race by region interaction effects.)

1. Northerners find direct reference political ads to be more INFORMATIVE than do Southerners.

   (Overall, Northern and Southern respondents indicated that the ads were slightly informative.)

2. Southerners are more likely to see attacks in NEWS AND SPEECHES (as compared to political ads) than do Northereners.

   (Overall, both Northern and Southern respondents were slightly positive toward the statement questioning whether they see as many attacks in news and speeches as in political ads.)

3. Northerners are more favorable toward direct reference PRODUCT ADVERTISING than are Southerners.

   (Overall, both Northerners and Southerners were slightly negative toward the statement that attacking product ads made them more positive toward the source of the ad.)

Value Differences: (Only non-interactive value differences are summarized below. Interaction effects are listed with race.)

1. Respondents scoring high on Identification with a Group see direct reference political ads as more UNETHICAL, more INFORMATIVE, and more AFFECTIVE than do those scoring low on this dimension.

   (Overall, both high and low Group I.D. respondents were saying the ads were slightly unethical, slightly informative and slightly on the negative side of the affect scale.)

2. Respondents with high Need for Stability are more positive toward direct reference PRODUCT ADVERTISING than are those with low Need for Stability.

   (Overall, both high and low need for stability respondents were negative toward the statement contending that attacking product ads made them more positive toward the source of the ad.)

Racial Differences:

1. Blacks find direct reference political ads to be more INFORMATIVE than do Whites and this is more true for Blacks scoring high on Cooperation Toward Group Goals than for Blacks scoring low on this dimension.

   (Overall, Blacks were saying the ads were slightly informative while Whites responded negatively to the contention that attacking ads are informative.)

2. Blacks find direct reference political ads to be more AFFECTIVE than do Whites and, as opposed to Whites, this is more true for Blacks with high...

   (a) Need for Stability,
   (b) Concern for the Social Welfare of Others, and
   (c) Cooperation Toward Group Goals...

   than for Blacks scoring low on these dimensions

   (Overall, both Blacks and Whites responded negatively to the contentions that attacking ads are affective.)

3. Blacks, as opposed to Whites, are less likely to see attacks in NEWS AND SPEECHES (as compared to political ads) and, contrary to Whites, this is more true for Blacks low in Concern for the Social Welfare of Others than for those high in concern.

   (Overall, both Blacks and Whites were slightly positive toward the statement questioning whether they see as many attacks in news and speeches as in political ads.)

4. Blacks are more positive toward direct reference PRODUCT ADVERTISING than are Whites and, as opposed to Whites, this is more true for Blacks with high...

   (a) Concern for the Social Welfare of Others, and
   (b) Cooperation Toward Group Goals...

   than for Blacks scoring low on these dimensions.

   (Overall, both Blacks and Whites were slightly negative toward the statement contending that attacking product ads made them more positive toward the source of the ad.)

DISCUSSION

Attitudes toward direct reference political and commerical advertising were differentiated on the basis of socioeconomic status, region, race and the underlying value system of the respondent. Coherent discussion of these findings in terms of a parsimonious explanation can at best be speculative given the scarcity of related research.

The single construct that seems to relate to each of the findings in the present study and, indeed, produced the strongest and most consistent differences, is that of the information value of the attacking ads. Keeping in mind the attitudinal nature of the present data, it is logical to assume that when asked to judge the concept of the attacking ad, the respondents applied at least one major dimension of evaluation. In this case, the information value dimension appears to be dominant. Through some crude theorizing, each of the major areas of significant findings can be related to this information dimension. Again, these speculations are intended to suggest potential areas of inquiry more than to establish conclusions relative to the present data.

Socioeconomic Status (SES) Differences. The SES differences seem to point to differing conceptions of what political advertising is expected to do. Lower class respondents may be somewhat more naive

about the political process than are their middle class counterparts and, as such, their expectation is that political ads should be informative. (In the present study, this was the finding.) If one assumes this basic information expectation, political ads that attack would be inconsistent with the expectation that such ads should inform. Thus, attacking ads would be seen as more Unethical by respondents who hold this expectation. (The finding in the present study.)

In the News and Speeches situation, it is possible, and some research suggests that, the lower SES respondents simply take in less of this type of information. It follows then, that they would be less likely to report seeing attacks in news and speeches as often as would middle SES respondents (the present finding).

What of the attacking Product Advertising in which lower SES respondents were more positive toward such ads than middle SES. Again, if the theory of expectations holds true, the expectation may simply differ. In the product situation, competition is the norm whereas information was the norm in the political situation. Thus, expecting competition and wanting the best information available, (especially for the lower SES person whose information sources may be limited) the result is a slightly more positive evaluation of the attacking product ad.

Regional Differences. The evidence of the present data indicates that Southerners see more attacks in News and Speeches than do Northerners; yet, historically the south is the region of the country with the fewest complaints about abusive political advertising. Thus, assuming there are as many attacking ads in the south as in the north (and there is no evidence to the contrary), Southerners may be more tolerant or have a lower sensitivity to verbal attacks. If this logic holds, it follows that Southerners would indicate that the attacking ads are also less informative (the finding in the present study).

Considering the finding that Northerners are more positive than Southerners toward attacking Product Advertising, the same rationale holds. Here, if Southerners are more tolerant toward attacking ads than are Northerners, and if they find these ads to be less informative, then this tolerance might produce a reduced evaluation of the worth of attacking product ads. Thus, Southerners would rate the attacking product ads as less favorable than would the Northerners (the present finding).

Racial and Value Differences. The racial-value system differences can also be interpreted through the Information-Expectation formulation. This proposition assumed that a major dimension of evaluation of political advertising will be in terms of its expected information value. The same logic applied to the lower vs. middle SES group comparison can be applied to the racial groups. The racial differences appear to mirror the SES differences with the Blacks taking the role of the lower SES group. However, it should be kept in mind that the Black-White differences were independent of SES differences when these two factors were examined in the two-way analyses of covariance. The assumption then, would be that Blacks expect the political ads to be more informative than do Whites (the present finding). The interaction effect can be interpreted in information value terms. Here, given the racial difference, those high in Cooperation Toward Group Goals as opposed to those low on this dimension would be expected to be more information oriented as a way to fulfill and enhance that cooperativeness.

The Affect dimension is closely related to the information factor. The logic here is that Blacks score higher on the affect dimension than do Whites because, again, the ad that provides more information would be more favored and Blacks see these ads as providing more information.

The interaction effects follow this same information logic: (1) Those with high need for stability should feel a stronger need for information to maintain that stability, (2) those feeling a higher concern for the social welfare of others should be more information-oriented than those of lower concern, and (3) those high in cooperation toward group goals would be more information oriented than those low in cooperation. Thus, given these stronger information orientations, a more positive score on the affect dimension is the consequence.

On the Product Advertising dimension where Blacks are more positive than Whites, the expectation proposition which held for the SES groups can again be applied to these differences. The norm in the product situation is competition and this competition situation is not inconsistent with the information expectation. In fact, the direct comparison may appear to be more informative. Thus, for Blacks, as opposed to Whites, attacking ads seem to provide more positive information. The fact that this is more true for Blacks high in Concern for the Social Welfare of others and high in Cooperation Toward Group Goals is consistent. These types of people would be more interested in fair play and in achieving the best for everyone in their group and the added positive information should help to provide this.

CONCLUSION

It is evident from the findings of the present study that racial differences in attitudes toward direct reference ads should not be interpreted independently of the respondents value system. Significant interaction effects exist. The present study only begins to recognize the complexity of these interactions and to specify some relevant value dimensions involved.

In sum, more research, both survey and experimental, of a multivariate nature is needed. The summary of findings, offered as hypotheses for future testing, need to be verified. As well, although the Information-Expectation formulation appears to explain and interrelate most of the present data, the basic assumptions of this proposition need to be verified.

REFERENCES

Archibald, Samuel J., "A Brief History of Dirty Politics," in Ray Hicbert, Robert Jones, John Lorenz and Ernest Lotito (eds), The Political Image Merchants: Strategies in the New Politics. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1971a pp. 230-236.

Archibald, Samuel J., The Pollution of Politics: A Research/ Reporting Team Investigates Campaign Ethics, Washington D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1971b pp. 1-21.

Archibald, Samuel J., (Executive Director, Fair Campaign Practices Committee). Information provided in an interview on KYW news radio, November 5, 1972, 1:50 p.m.

Gilbert, Robert E, Television and Presidential Politics. North Quincy, Mass: The Christopher Publishing House, 1972. pp. 91-126.

Mickelson, Sig, The Electric Mirror: Politics in an Age of Television. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1972. pp. 240-269.

Nimmo, Dan, The Political Persuaders: The Techniques of Modern Election Campaigns. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, 1970

Perloe, S.I., "The Factorial Structure of the Social Values Questionnaire" Dittoed Manuscript, October, 1967. In J. Robinson and P. Shaver, Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, August, 1969. pp. 495-501.

"Political Advertising Leveled Off in 1972," Broadcasting, May 14, 1973. pp. 25-26.

Rehfisch, J., "Some Scale and Test Correlates of a Personality Rigidity Scale," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958 22, 372-374. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, August, 1969. pp. 304-308.

Sheinkopf, Kenneth G., "Political Advertising and Dirty Politics: What to Expect in '72." Paper presented to Advertising Division, Association for Education in Journalism, Carbondale, Ill., August, 1972.

TABLE 1

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF VALUE ITEMS

FACTOR 1: Identification With Groups	Factor Loadings
Items:*	
People do not really fulfill their human potentials unless they involve themselves deeply in some groups	.73
It is wrong if a person refuses to participate actively in some of the group activities in his community	.55
It is just as important to work toward group goals and uphold the rules of the group as it is to satisfy one's individual desires.....	.32
% Total Variance:	17.2%
FACTOR 2: Need for Stability.....	Factor Loadings
It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.....	.43
I don't like to undertake projects unless I have a good idea how they will turn out.....	.46
I like things to be certain and predictable.....	.76
% Total Variance:	11.4%
FACTOR 3: Social Welfare,.....	Factor Loadings
Everyone has the obligation to protect the rights and interests of others in his community.....	.53
People who are unable to provide for themselves have a right to expect help from others.....	.38
People should feel responsible for improving the morals as well as the well being of others.....	.52
% Total Variance:	9.0%
FACTOR 4: Cooperation Toward Group Goals	Factor Loadings
A person should be willing to openly criticize people who break the rules agreed upon by the community.....	.45

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

A person should go along with democratically selected group leaders, even though they are not the ones he personally prefers.....	.32
A person is right in feeling angry when other members of his group ignor reasonable group demands.....	.45
% Total Variance:	8.6%

Percent total variance explained by the four factors: 46.2%

The following two items were too impure to be assigned to a single factor and were dropped from subsequent analyses:

A person who seldom changes his mind can usually be counted upon to have sound judgement on matters of importance.

Members of a group should try to persuade indifferent or opposing members to go along with the group.

*All items were responded to on the following scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Netural, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Scale values of 1-5 were used, Strongly Agree being 1.

TABLE 2

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE POLITICAL ADVERTISING

FACTOR 1: Unethical	Factor Loadings
Items:	
Political advertising which attacks the other candidate personally is unethical	.48
Political advertising which attacks the issues for which the other candidate stands is unethical	.66
Political advertising which attacks the party of the other candidate is unethical	.73
% Total Variance:	27.1%

FACTOR 2: Informative	Factor Loadings
Political advertising that attacks the opposing candidate in any fashion usually gives me new information about the candidate	.46
Political advertising that attacks the opposing candidate is effective in making its point	.56
% Total Variance:	22.7%

FACTOR 3: Affective	Factor Loadings
Political advertising that attacks the opposing candidate is entertaining	.31
Political advertising that attacks the opposing candidate usually makes me more favorable toward the candidate who sponsored the ad	.44
% Total Variance:	13.0%

Percent total variance explained by the three factors: 62.8%

TABLE 3A

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

RACE X GROUP I.D. CELLS	N		Need for Stability	Cooperation	Social Welfare
White High Group I.D.	91	$\bar{X}$	7.53	7.69	6.19
		SD	2.76	2.45	2.09
White Moderate Group I.D.	337	$\bar{X}$	8.51	8.43	7.31
		SD	2.48	2.01	2.00
Black High Group I.D.	29	$\bar{X}$	7.41	7.31	5.52
		SD	2.11	2.63	2.21
Black Moderate Group I.D.	82	$\bar{X}$	7.57	8.94	6.57
		SD	2.39	2.36	2.17

TABLE 3B

RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Group I.D.	Moderate Group I.D.
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.87	8.66
	SD	2.85	2.51
	N	91	337
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	7.83	8.16
	SD	2.24	2.54
	N	29	82

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	37.22	3	12.41	1.90	ns
Race	9.32	1	9.32	1.43	ns
Group I.D.	43.02	1	43.02	6.58	.02
Race X I.D.	1.66	1	1.66	.25	ns
Error	3476.04	532	6.53		

[1]See Table 3A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Cooperation, Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE 3C

RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Group I.D.	Moderate Group I.D.
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	5.99	6.40
	SD	1.95	1.75
	N	91	337
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	4.41	5.43
	SD	1.52	1.48
	N	29	82

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	11.73	3	3.91	1.30	ns
Race	109.52	1	109.52	36.48	.001
Group I.D.	17.94	1	17.94	5.98	.02
Race X I.D.	5.17	1	5.17	1.72	ns
Error	1597.07	532	3.00		

[1] See Table 3A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Cooperation, Social Welfare.

[2] The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE 3D

RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE [1]

A. Means[2]

		High Group I.D.	Moderate Group I.D.
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.06	7.55
	SD	1.79	1.36
	N	91	337
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	6.45	7.06
	SD	2.13	1.66
	N	29	82

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	4.84	3	1.61	.70	ns
Race	24.33	1	24.33	10.51	.001
Group I.D.	18.71	1	18.71	8.08	.005
Race X I.D.	.16	1	.16	.07	ns
Error	1231.20	532	2.31		

[1] See Table 3A for mean and SD values of covariates: Need for Stability, Cooperation, Social Welfare.

[2] The lower the mean, the more affective.

TABLE 3E

RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Group I.D.	Moderate Group I.D.
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.54	2.61
	SD	1.09	1.00
	N	91	337
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.31	2.71
	SD	1.00	1.07
	N	29	82

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	2.35	3	.78	.74	ns
Race	.16	1	.16	.15	ns
Group I.D.	1.34	1	1.34	1.26	ns
Race X I.D.	2.14	1	2.14	2.02	ns
Error	563.96	532	1.06		

[1] See Table 3A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Cooperation, Social Welfare.

[2] The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE 3F

RACE BY GROUP I.D. ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Group I.D.	Moderate Group I.D.
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.64	3.71
	SD	1.02	.86
	N	91	337
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.17	3.45
	SD	1.20	1.01
	N	29	82

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	18.27	3	6.09	7.25	.001
Race	7.07	1	7.07	8.42	.004
Group I.D.	.48	1	.48	.57	ns
Race X I.D.	.96	1	.96	1.14	ns
Error	446.71	532	.84		

[1]See Table 3A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Cooperation, Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking product advertising.

TABLE 4A

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF
COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY
ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

RACE X NEED FOR STABILITY CELLS	N		Cooperation	Group I.D.	Social Welfare
White High Need for Stability	125	$\bar{X}$	8.18	8.21	7.01
		SD	2.55	247	2.09
White Moderate Need for Stability	303	$\bar{X}$	8.31	9.06	7.10
		SD	1.94	2.29	2.06
Black High Need for Stability	47	$\bar{X}$	7.98	8.43	6.11
		SD	2.45	2.53	2.01
Black Moderate Need for Stability	64	$\bar{X}$	8.91	8.52	6.44
		SD	2.52	2.57	2.37

TABLE 4B

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Need for Stability	Moderate Need for Stability
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	8.10	8.65
	SD	2.66	2.57
	N	125	303
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	8.30	7.91
	SD	2.13	2.68
	N	47	64

B. Covariance Table

SORUCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	98.13	3	32.71	5.07	.002
Race	9.53	1	9.53	1.48	ns
Stability	7.38	1	7.38	1.15	ns
Race X Stability	11.34	1	11.34	1.76	ns
Error	3430.60	532	6.45		

[1]See Table 4A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE 4C

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERNCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Need for Stability	Moderate Need for Stability
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	6.29	6.32
	SD	1.91	1.75
	N	125	303
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	4.83	5.41
	SD	1.26	1.71
	N	47	64

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	30.40	3	10.13	3.36	.02
Race	109.29	1	109.29	36.26	.001
Stability	.99	1	.99	.33	ns
Race X Stability	5.92	1	5.92	1.97	ns
Error	1603.25	532	3.01		

[1]See Table 4A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE 4D

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Need for Stability	Moderate Need for Stability
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.22	7.54
	SD	1.60	1.38
	N	125	303
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	7.13	6.73
	SD	1.57	1.95
	N	47	64

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	14.30	3	4.77	2.06	.10
Race	24.35	1	24.35	10.50	.001
Stability	1.38	1	1.38	.60	ns
Race X Stability	10.88	1	10.88	4.69	.03
Error	1233.90	532	2.32		

[1]See Table 4A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more affective.

TABLE 4E

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Need for Stability	Moderate Need for Stability
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.62	2.58
	SD	1.10	.99
	N	1.25	303
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.47	2.70
	SD	.98	1.12
	N	47	64

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	1.97	3	.66	.62	ns
Race	.10	1	.10	.09	ns
Stability	.04	1	.04	1.04	ns
Race X Stability	1.74	1	1.74	1.63	ns
Error	566.42	532	1.07		

[1]See Table 4A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE 4F

RACE BY NEED FOR STABILITY ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING.

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Need for Stability	Moderate Need for Stability
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.55	3.75
	SD	1.03	.83
	N	125	303
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.28	3.45
	SD	1.02	1.10
	N	47	64

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	4.78	3	1.59	1.85	ns
Race	9.59	1	9.59	11.15	.001
Stability	3.39	1	3.39	3.94	.05
Race x Stability	.003	1	.003	.003	ns
Error	457.84	532	.86		

[1] See Table 4A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2] The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking product advertising.

TABLE 5A

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF
COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE
ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

RACE X SOCIAL WELFARE CELLS	N		Cooperation	Group I.D.	Need for Stability
White High Social Welfare	176	$\bar{X}$	8.03	8.32	8.24
		SD	2.15	2.54	2.57
White Moderate Social Welfare	252	$\bar{X}$	8.44	9.15	8.35
		SD	2.10	2.19	2.58
Black High Social Welfare	70	$\bar{X}$	8.06	7.96	7.37
		SD	2.69	2.61	2.22
Black Moderate Social Welfare	41	$\bar{X}$	9.29	9.37	7.81
		SD	2.03	2.19	2.47

TABLE 5B

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Social Welfare	Moderate Social Welfare
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	8.43	8.54
	SD	2.62	2.60
	N	176	252
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	8.11	8.00
	SD	2.45	2.51
	N	70	41

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	119.47	3	39.83	6.16	.001
Race	7.67	1	7.67	1.19	ns
Social Welfare	.29	1	.29	.04	ns
Race X Social Welfare	1.34	1	1.34	.21	ns
Error	3439.33	532	6.47		

[1]See Table 5A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Cooperation, Group I.D., Need for Stability.

[2]The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE 5C

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Social Welfare	Moderate Social Welfare
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	6.24	6.36
	SD	1.81	1.79
	N	176	252
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	5.03	5.39
	SD	1.58	1.50
	N	70	41

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	28.24	3	9.41	3.11	.03
Race	111.57	1	111.57	36.88	.001
Social Welfare	.60	1	.60	.20	ns
Race X Social Welfare	.42	1	.42	.14	ns
Error	1609.57	532	3.03		

[1]See Table 5A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Cooperation, Group I.D., Need for Stability.

[2]The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE 5D

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Social Welfare	Moderate Social Welfare
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.50	7.41
	SD	1.44	1.47
	N	176	252
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	6.53	7.54
	SD	1.92	1.40
	N	70	41

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	11.95	3	3.98	1.73	ns
Race	23.86	1	23.86	10.39	.001
Social Welfare	.46	1	.46	.20	ns
Race X Social Welfare	22.29	1	22.29	9.70	.002
Error	1222.40	532	2.30		

[1]See Table 5A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Need for Stability.

[2]The lower the mean, the more affective.

TABLE 5E

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Social Welfare	Moderate Social Welfare
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.62	2.57
	SD	1.06	.99
	N	176	252
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.46	2.85
	SD	1.05	1.06
	N	70	41

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	2.33	3	.78	.73	ns
Race	.11	1	.11	.10	ns
Social Welfare	.13	1	.13	.12	ns
Race X Social Welfare	4.00	1	4.00	3.78	.05
Error	563.37	532	1.06		

[1] See Table 5A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Need for Stability.

[2] The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE 5F

RACE BY SOCIAL WELFARE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Social Welfare	Moderate Social Welfare
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.75	3.66
	SD	.90	.89
	N	176	252
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.24	3.61
	SD	1.10	.97
	N	70	41

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	17.56	3	5.86	7.00	.001
Race	6.03	1	6.03	7.21	.007
Social Welfare	.19	1	.19	.23	ns
Race X Social Welfare	3.57	1	3.57	4.27	.04
Error	445.03	532	.84		

[1]See 5A for mean and SD values of covariates: Cooperation, Group I.D., Need for Stability.

[2]The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking product advertising.

TABLE 6A

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

RACE X COOPERATION CELLS	N		Need for Stability	Group I.D.	Social Welfare
White High Cooperation	98	$\bar{X}$	8.19	8.06	6.81
		SD	2.70	2.49	2.14
White Moderate Cooperation	330	$\bar{X}$	8.33	9.03	7.15
		SD	2.53	2.29	2.04
Black High Cooperation	26	$\bar{X}$	6.50	7.81	5.23
		SD	1.82	3.09	1.24
Black Moderate Cooperation	85	$\bar{X}$	7.85	8.68	6.62
		SD	2.37	2.34	2.36

TABLE 6B

RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Cooperation	Moderate Cooperation
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	8.61	8.46
	SD	2.86	2.53
	N	98	330
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	8.15	8.05
	SD	2.78	2.37
	N	26	85

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	98.85	3	32.95	5.07	.002
Race	9.15	1	9.15	1.41	NS
Cooperation	9.51	1	9.51	1.46	NS
Race X Cooperation	.001	1	.001	.000	NS
Error	3459.43	532	6.50		

[1]See Table 6A for mean and SD values of covariates: Need for Stability, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE 6C

RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Cooperation	Moderate Cooperation
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	6.31	6.31
	SD	2.06	1.71
	N	98	330
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	4.42	5.39
	SD	1.14	1.60
	N	26	85

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	17.35	3	5.78	1.92	ns
Race	103.99	1	103.99	34.43	.001
Cooperation	1.50	1	1.50	.50	ns
Race X Cooperation	13.65	1	13.65	4.52	.03
Error	1606.85	532	3.02		

[1]See Table 6A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE 6D

RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Cooperation	Moderate Cooperation
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.33	7.48
	SD	1.72	1.37
	N	98	330
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	6.19	7.12
	SD	2.50	1.48
	N	26	85

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	7.60	3	2.53	1.09	ns
Race	22.36	1	22.36	9.63	.002
Cooperation	6.36	1	6.36	2.74	.10
Race X Cooperation	8.82	1	8.82	3.80	.02
Error	1238.16	532	2.32		

[1] See Table 6A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2] The lower the mean, the more affective.

TABLE 6E

RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDED TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Cooperation	Moderate Cooperation
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.71	2.56
	SD	1.20	.96
	N	98	330
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.39	2.67
	SD	1.13	1.04
	N	26	85

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	2.67	3	.89	.84	ns
Race	.14	1	.14	.13	ns
Cooperation	.84	1	.84	.79	ns
Race X Cooperation	2.65	1	2.65	2.50	ns
Error	563.78	532	1.06		

[1]See Table 6A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE 6F

RACE BY COOPERATION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		High Cooperation	Moderate Cooperation
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.81	3.66
	SD	1.01	.86
	N	98	330
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.00	3.49
	SD	1.13	1.02
	N	26	85

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	18.26	3	6.09	7.32	.001
Race	6.77	1	6.77	8.15	.004
Cooperation	.19	1	.19	.23	ns
Race X Cooperation	5.57	1	5.57	6.70	.01
Error	442.30	532	.83		

[1]See Table 6A for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Group I.D., Social Welfare.

[2]The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking product advertising.

APPENDIX A

Tables for

Race By Socioeconomic Status (SES)

Analysis of Covariance

TABLE A1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANAYLSES OF COVARIANCE.

RACE X SES CELLS	N		Need for Stability	Social Welfare	Cooperation	Group I. D.
White Middle Class	234	$\bar{X}$	8.72	7.02	8.12	8.75
		SD	2.55	2.04	2.07	2.35
White Lower Class	191	$\bar{X}$	7.83	7.08	8.45	8.85
		SD	2.52	2.08	2.21	2.40
Black Middle Class	30	$\bar{X}$	8.27	6.83	8.80	8.67
		SD	2.29	2.23	2.09	2.01
Black Lower Class	81	$\bar{X}$	7.26	6.10	8.41	8.41
		SD	2.28	2.20	2.57	2.72

TABLE A2

RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANALYSIS
OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES
TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL[1]

A. Means[2]

		Middle Class	Lower Class
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	8.81	8.06
	SD	2.48	2.70
	N	234	191
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	8.50	7.91
	SD	2.75	2.34
	N	30	81

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	108.58	4	27.15	4.26	.002
Race	7.92	1	7.92	1.24	ns
SES	56.72	1	56.72	8.89	.003
Race X SES	.41	1	.41	.07	ns
Error	3368.29	528	6.38		

[1] See Table A1 for mean and SD values of covaraiates: Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group Identification.

[2] The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE A3

RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE [1]

A. Means[2]

		Middle Class	Lower Class
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	6.55	6.05
	SD	1.79	1.78
	N	234	191
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	5.33	5.10
	SD	1.21	1.66
	N	30	81

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	38.32	4	9.58	3.23	.01
Race	110.67	1	110.67	37.26	.001
SES	28.12	1	28.12	9.47	.002
Race X SES	2.39	1	2.39	.80	NS
Error	1568.12	528	2.97		

[1] See Table A1 for mean and SD values of covariates: Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2] The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE A4

RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANALYSIS
OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES
TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		Middle Class	Lower Class
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.41	7.48
	SD	1.38	1.55
	N	234	191
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	6.90	6.90
	SD	1.42	1.93
	N	30	81

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	16.60	4	4.15	1.76	ns
Race	22.39	1	22.39	9.51	.002
SES	.60	1	.60	.25	ns
Race X SES	.003	1	.003	..001	ns
Error	1243.61	528	2.36		

[1] See Table A1 for mean and SD values of covariates: Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation Group Identification.

TABLE A5

RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		Middle Class	Lower Class
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.53	2.68
	SD	1.01	1.04
	N	234	191
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.47	2.65
	SD	1.01	1.09
	N	30	81

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	4.25	4	1.06	1.00	ns
Race	.21	1	.21	.20	ns
SES	3.90	1	3.90	3.68	.06
Race X SES	.06	1	.06	.06	ns
Error	559.71	528	1.06		

[1]See Table A1 for mean and SD values of covariates: Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2]The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE A6

RACE BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (SES) ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		Middle Class	Lower Class
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.80	3.58
	SD	.78	1.01
	N	234	191
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.34	3.36
	SD	.97	1.01
	N	30	81

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	17.55	4	4.39	5.25	.001
Race	7.24	1	7.24	8.67	.003
SES	2.50	1	2.50	3.00	.08
Race X SES	.39	1	..39	.47	ns
Error	441.08	528	.84		

[1] See Table A1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2] The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking Product Advertising.

APPENDIX B

Tables for

Race By Region

Analysis of Covariance

TABLE B1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATION VALUES OF COVARIATES USED IN RACE BY REGION ANALYSES OF COVARIANCE

RACE X REGION CELLS	N		Need for Stability	Social Welfare	Cooperation	Group I.D.
White North	247	$\bar{X}$	8.29	6.83	8.02	8.65
		SD	2.66	2.00	2.06	2.26
White South	181	$\bar{X}$	8.32	7.40	8.61	9.03
		SD	2.45	2.12	2.18	2.50
Black North	75	$\bar{X}$	7.48	6.28	8.35	8.55
		SD	2.37	2.22	2.61	2.73
Black South	36	$\bar{X}$	7.64	6.33	8.86	8.33
		SD	2.22	2.69	2.33	2.13

TABLE B2

RACE BY REGION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: UNETHICAL [1]

A. Means[2]

		North	South
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	8.42	8.59
	SD	2.70	2.48
	N	247	181
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	8.04	8.14
	SD	2.69	1.92
	N	75	36

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	119.95	4	29.99	4.63	.001
Race	7.47	1	7.47	1.15	ns
Region	3.86	1	3.86	.60	ns
Race X Region	.002	1	.002	.000	ns
Error	3437.03	531	6.47		

[1] See Table B1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2] The lower the mean, the more unethical.

TABLE B3

RACE BY REGION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: INFORMATIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		North	South
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	6.16	6.52
	SD	1.79	1.79
	N	247	181
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	4.96	5.58
	SD	1.49	1.61
	N	75	36

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	27.48	4	6.87	2.29	.06
Race	106.94	1	106.94	35.67	.001
Region	15.63	1	15.63	5.21	.02
Race X Region	1.87	1	1.87	.62	NS
Error	1592.18	331	3.00		

[1] See Table B1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2] The lower the mean, the more informative.

TABLE B4

RACE BY REGION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: AFFECTIVE[1]

A. Means[2]

		North	South
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	7.46	7.43
	SD	1.46	1.45
	N	247	181
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	7.05	6.58
	SD	1.88	1.61
	N	75	36

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	17.78	4	4.45	1.91	.108
Race	22.59	1	22.59	9.69	.002
Region	3.28	1	3.28	1.45	ns
Race X Region	3.23	1	3.23	1.39	ns
Error	1238.30	531	2.33		

[1] See Table B1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2] The lower the mean, the more affective.

TABLE B5

RACE BY REGION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: NEWS AND SPEECHES[1]

A. Means[2]

		North	South
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	2.67	2.49
	SD	1.05	.98
	N	247	181
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	2.64	2.53
	SD	1.07	1.06
	N	75	36

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	3.42	4	.86	.81	ns
Race	.20	1	.20	.19	ns
Region	3.99	1	3.99	3.76	.05
Race X Region	.14	1	.14	.13	ns
Error	562.83	531	1.06		

[1]See Table B1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group I.D.

[2]The lower the mean, the more attacks seen in news and speeches.

TABLE B6

RACE BY REGION ANALYSIS OF
COVARIANCE FOR ATTITUDES TOWARD
DIRECT REFERENCE ADVERTISING

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PRODUCT ADVERTISING[1]

A. Means[2]

		North	South
WHITE	$\bar{X}$	3.62	3.80
	SD	.93	.84
	N	247	181
BLACK	$\bar{X}$	3.36	3.42
	SD	1.10	1.00
	N	75	36

B. Covariance Table

SOURCE:	SS	DF	MS	F	P
Regression	20.06	4	5.02	6.00	.001
Race	7.05	1	7.05	8.44	.004
Region	2.81	1	2.81	3.37	.07
Race X Region	.34	1	.34	.41	ns
Error	443.63	531	.84		

[1]See Table B1 for mean and SD values of covariates:
Need for Stability, Social Welfare, Cooperation, Group T.D.

[2]The lower the mean, the more favorable toward attacking product advertising.

APPENDIX C

Summary Table : Probability Values

For Two-Way Analyses of Covariance

Within Region Comparisons

APPENDIX C
Summary Table of Probability Values
For Two-Way Analyses of Covariance

Within Region Comparisons[1]

Dependent Variable	Region	Race (R) by: Group Identification(GI) Race	GI	R x GID	Need for Stability(NFS) Race	NFS	R x NSF	Social Welfare (SW) Race	SW	R x SW	Cooperation (Coop) Race	Coop	R x Coop
UNETHICAL	North	ns	.01	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	South[2]	—	—	—	ns	.09	ns	ns	ns	ns	—	—	—
INFORMATIVE	North	.001	ns	ns	.001	ns	ns	.001	ns	ns	.001	s	.11
	South	—	—	—	.02	ns	ns	.008	.10	ns	—	—	—
AFFECTIVE	North	.07	.03	ns	.05	ns	.003	.06	ns	ns	.08	ns	ns
	South	—	—	—	.003	ns	ns	.002	ns	.001	—	—	—
NEWS AND SPEECHES	North	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	.06	.04
	South	—	—	—	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	—	—	—
PRODUCT ADVTSG.	North	.04	ns	ns	.01	.03	ns	.08	.09	.05	.07	ns	ns
	South	—	—	—	.03	ns	ns	.04	ns	ns	—	—	—

[1]Complete Ancova Tables are available on request from Professor Gordon.

[2]The Group I.D. and Cooperation factors for the Southern comparison resulted in cell sizes that were too small for reliable statistical comparisons.